#### §50.17

charge relating to the conduct concerning which representation was undertaken.

[Order No. 970–82, 47 FR 8174, Feb. 25, 1982, as amended by Order No. 1409–90, 55 FR 13130, Apr. 9, 1990]

### § 50.17 Ex parte communications in informal rulemaking proceedings.

In rulemaking proceedings subject only to the procedural requirements of 5 U.S.C. 553:

- (a) A general prohibition applicable to all offices, boards, bureaus and divisions of the Department of Justice against the receipt of private, ex parte oral or written communications is undesirable, because it would deprive the Department of the flexibility needed to fashion rulemaking procedures appropriate to the issues involved, and would introduce a degree of formality that would, at least in most instances, result in procedures that are unduly complicated, slow, and expensive, and, at the same time, perhaps not conducive to developing all relevant information.
- (b) All written communications from outside the Department addressed to the merits of a proposed rule, received after notice of proposed informal rule-making and in its course by the Department, its offices, boards, and bureaus, and divisions or their personnel participating in the decision, should be placed promptly in a file available for public inspection.
- (c) All oral communications from outside the Department of significant information or argument respecting the merits of a proposed rule, received after notice of proposed informal rule-making and in its course by the Department, its offices, boards, bureaus, and divisions or their personnel participating in the decision, should be summarized in writing and placed promptly in a file available for public inspection.
- (d) The Department may properly withhold from the public files information exempt from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. 552.
- (e) The Department may conclude that restrictions on  $\it ex~parte$  communications in particular rulemaking pro-

ceedings are necessitated by considerations of fairness or for other reasons.

[Order No. 801–78, 43 FR 43297, Sept. 25, 1978, as amended at Order No. 1409–90, 55 FR 13130, Apr. 9, 1990]

#### §50.18 [Reserved]

# § 50.19 Procedures to be followed by government attorneys prior to filing recusal or disqualification motions.

The determination to seek for any reason the disqualification or recusal of a justice, judge, or magistrate is a most significant and sensitive decision. This is particularly true for government attorneys, who should be guided by uniform procedures in obtaining the requisite authorization for such a motion. This statement is designed to establish a uniform procedure.

- (a) No motion to recuse or disqualify a justice, judge, or magistrate (see, e.g., 28 U.S.C. 144, 455) shall be made or supported by any Department of Justice attorney, U.S. Attorney (including Assistant U.S. Attorneys) or agency counsel conducting litigation pursuant to agreement with or authority delegated by the Attorney General, without the prior written approval of the Assistant Attorney General having ultimate supervisory power over the action in which recusal or disqualification is being considered.
- (b) Prior to seeking such approval. Justice Department lawyer(s) handling the litigation shall timely seek the recommendations of the U.S. Attorney for the district in which the matter is pending, and the views of the client agencies, if any. Similarly, if agency attorneys are primarily handling any such suit, they shall seek the recommendations of the U.S. Attorney and provide them to the Department of Justice with the request for approval. In actions where the United States Attorneys are primarily handling the litigation in question, they shall seek the recommendation of the client agencies, if any, for submission to the Assistant Attorney General.
- (c) In the event that the conduct and pace of the litigation does not allow sufficient time to seek the prior written approval by the Assistant Attorney General, prior oral authorization shall

be sought and a written record fully reflecting that authorization shall be subsequently prepared and submitted to the Assistant Attorney General.

- (d) Assistant Attorneys General may delegate the authority to approve or deny requests made pursuant to this section, but only to Deputy Assistant Attorneys General or an equivalent position.
- (e) This policy statement does not create or enlarge any legal obligations upon the Department of Justice in civil or criminal litigation, and it is not intended to create any private rights enforceable by private parties in litigation with the United States.

[Order No. 977-82, 47 FR 22094, May 21, 1982]

## §50.20 Participation by the United States in court-annexed arbitration.

- (a) Considerations affecting participation in arbitration. (1) The Department recognizes and supports the general goals of court-annexed arbitrations, which are to reduce the time and expenses required to dispose of civil litigation. Experimentations with such procedures in appropriate cases can offer both the courts and litigants an opportunity to determine the effectiveness of arbitration as an alternative to traditional civil litigation.
- (2) An arbitration system, however, is best suited for the resolution of relatively simple factual issues, not for trying cases that may involve complex issues of liability or other unsettled legal questions. To expand an arbitration system beyond the types of cases for which it is best suited and most competent would risk not only a decrease in the quality of justice available to the parties but unnecessarily higher costs as well.
- (3) In particular, litigation involving the United States raises special concerns with respect to court-annexed arbitration programs. A mandatory arbitration program potentially implicates the principles of separation of powers, sovereign immunity, and the Attorney General's control over the process of settling litigation.
- (b) General rule consenting to arbitration consistent with the department's regulations. (1) Subject to the considerations set forth in the following paragraphs and the restrictions set forth in

- paragraphs (c) and (d), in a case assigned to arbitration or mediation under a local district court rule, the Department of Justice agrees to participate in the arbitration process under the local rule. The attorney for the government responsible for the case should take any appropriate steps in conducting the case to protect the interests of the United States.
- (2) Based upon its experience under arbitration programs to date, and the purposes and limitations of court-annexed arbitration, the Department generally endorses inclusion in a district's court-annexed arbitration program of civil actions—
- (i) In which the United States or a Department, agency, or official of the United States is a party, and which seek only money damages in an amount not in excess of \$100,000, exclusive of interest and costs; and
- (ii) Which are brought (A) under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. 1346(b), 2671 et seq., or (B) under the Longshoreman's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. 905, or (C) under the Miller Act, 40 U.S.C. 270(b).
- (3) In any other case in which settlement authority has been delegated to the U.S. Attorney under the regulations of the Department and the directives of the applicable litigation division and none of the exceptions to such delegation apply, the U.S. Attorney for the district, if he concludes that a settlement of the case upon the terms of the arbitration award would be appropriate, may proceed to settle the case accordingly.
- (4) Cases other than those described in paragraph (2) that are not within the delegated settlement authority of the U.S. Attorney for the district ordinarily are not appropriate for an arbitration process because the Department generally will not be able to act favorably or negatively in a short period of time upon a settlement of the case in accordance with the arbitration award. Therefore, this will result in a demand for trial de novo in a substantial proportion of such cases to preserve the interests of the United States.
- (5) The Department recommends that any district court's arbitration rule include a provision exempting any case